DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 206 155 FL 012 350

AUTHOR Klinck, Patricia A.
TITLE Evaluation of the Drop-in Centre. French Centre, University of Calgary 1980-81.
PUB DATE Apr 81
NOTE 97p.: For related documents see FL 012 353 and ED 201 179.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Second Language Programs; *Cultural Education; *Enrichment Activities; Extracurricular Activities; *French; Higher Education; *Native Speakers; Participant Satisfaction; Questionnaires; *Summative Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *University of Calgary (Canada)

ABSTRACT

A summative evaluation of the Drop-in center took place in order to: (1) observe French-speaking monitors during their sessions as hosts; (2) provide feedback on their ability to carry out this role; (3) monitor the implementation of changes previously recommended; (4) assess student reaction to the center programs by questionnaire; and (5) provide information to the French center for future funding possibilities. Fifty of the 100 student questionnaires were returned. In addition to the questionnaires, the evaluator was present during the times when the center was open to observe the monitors and to assess the general climate. The center's activities are both structured and unstructured, academically-oriented and social. Generally speaking, the center affords the opportunity to speak and read French and to associate with French-speaking persons. It was found that many professors choose to take their coffee breaks there, and that students and professors like to go there to read, chat, do assignments, and listen to music. According to the student questionnaires, the center was welcoming, helpful in learning French, and a good place to meet and converse with Francophiles. The appendices include the original proposal given to the appropriate department of the Province of Alberta for the establishment of the center, and the student questionnaire used in this study. (AMH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED206155

EVALUATION OF THE

DROP-IN CENTRE

FRENCH CENTRE

UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY

1980-81

by

P. Klinck

April 1981

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Patricia A. Klinck

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

5-81-54 FL 012 350

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Methods of Evaluation	1
III.	Essential Elements of the Drop-In Centre	2
	A. Personnel	2
	B. Site	2
	C. Participants	3
IV.	Description of Activities	3
V.	Assessment	4
	A. Student Group	4
	B. General Comments Based on Questionnaires	6
	C. Assessment of Monitors	7
	D. Review of 1980 Recommendations	8
VI.	Conclusion	9
	Appendices	10

I. Introduction

The French Drop-In Centre has been in operation since 1976. A summative evaluation was done in 1979-80 by Ms. P. Klinck, external evaluator. At that time suggestions were made to improve the program. It was suggested therefore that the 1980-81 program be formative in nature. (See Appendix A)

Evaluation

The purposes of this evaluation are:

1) to observe monitors during their sessions as hosts at the Drop-In Centre;
2) to provide necessary feedback on their ability to carry out their role as host;
3) to monitor the implementation of recommended changes and their impact on the Drop-In Centre;
4) to assess student reaction to the Drop-In Centre programs by questionnaire;
5) to provide information to the French Centre for future funding from various agencies.

II. Methods of Evaluation

The evaluator was present during the noonhour session to observe the interactions of monitors and Drop-In Centre participants. These observations were to address the following questions: Are monitors initiating conversation? Are they essentially playing the role of hosts, i.e. welcoming students? Is French the language of communication? Is the atmosphere conducive to pleasant social conversation?

Students were required to sign a log book at the door. Although this is not a satisfactory method of obtaining the names of all participants, it is the basis for the distribution of questionnaires. One hundred questionnaires were distributed through the Centre and by mail. Fifty were returned. They were cross-tabulated to analyze participant reaction. A résumé of written comments has been included in Appendix B.

III. Essential Elements of the Drop-In Centre

A) Personnel

Eight francophone monitors were employed. Hours were assigned between 11:00 and 14:00, 18:00 and 19:00 . Some adjustments in hours assigned were made as it became apparent which monitors were best filling the role of host.

All monitors are native speakers. Only one monitor was retained from last year's monitors.

A pre-session in-service was designed to accomplish the following goals:

a) Hôte du Centre français

b) Animateur de la conversation

c) Matériel du Centre

d) Activités linguistiques et sociales

e) Animateur des mini-situations.

B) Site

The same site was used as last year. It is a pleasant room although students complained of heat and lack of ventilation (Appendix B).

C) Participants

Of the participants surveyed (based on the list of those who signed in) the majority are students (N-48). They come from the Department of Romance Studies (N-37). The majority is fairly evenly divided: beginners (N-12), intermediate (N-16), advanced (N-11) and bilingual (N-5). The majority attended more than 10 times a year (N-39).

They attend the French Centre for the following reasons: to converse with francophones (N-28), to get help with problems in French (N-21) and to listen to music or read French publications (N-18). Many students indicated two reasons for coming to the Centre.

IV. Description of Activities

There are no structured activities on a daily basis. Students come for varying periods of time. They speak with friends, professors and monitors. Some listen to music, read periodicals or do homework.

In response to last year's questionnaire, the administration offered some structured activities: a reading of Prévert poetry, a talk on Quebec architecture, a Christmas party and a "Crêpe" day. These were well attended.

The main language used is French. English is heard from time to time but not extensively (Appendix B, Question 14).

It is estimated that the attendance at the French Centre has doubled. As no daily count has been taken, in the evaluator's opinion this estimate is conservative. The Centre is often packed at lunch time. Students stand and chat in groups when seating is limited. The number of professors attending has also increased. It has become a place where students and professors sit and chat. One of the professors pointed out that the majority of professors now come to the Centre for coffee breaks and lunch

rather than going to the Staff Lounge. The Director has given serious thought to opening the Centre for more hours a day. The demand seems to back this.

The role of host as undertaken by this year's monitors has greatly improved. Those who attend the Centre more than 10 times indicate that the major reason is the welcoming atmosphere. Literally no one found that the atmosphere inhibited their attendance.

V. Assessment

In this section of the report, an assessment will be made of the Drop-In Centre. It will be based on: an analysis of the questionnaires, an assessment of the monitors based on observations and data and on review of the implementation of the recommendations of the 1980 Evaluation.

A) The Student Group

1. Beginners - There is a significant increase in the number of beginners over last year. This year they represent 25% of the participants. 75% attended more than 10 times during the year. Some came to see friends at the Centre. This seems to indicate that a group of beginners came to see the Centre as a meeting place. They also came to speak French and get help. 75% also attended the activities put on by the Centre.

They heard about the Centre in the following ways (in order of importance): from their instructor, from the monitors' class visit or from friends.

They described the monitors as: made me feel welcome (N-15), gave help willingly (N-12).

Assessment:

In the evaluator's opinion the increase in beginners attending is most gratifying. This group is often the most inhibited and therefore the hardest to include in parascholastic activities. The Drop-In Centre has broken through this reserve. This can be attributed to the effort put forth by the Director in several directions: the monitors' visits to all classes and the morning immersions for beginners. Equally significant is the role of the monitor who is seen by all beginners as a welcoming, friendly person. One can hypothesize that the initial in-service and the diligence of the Director have fostered an understanding of the beginners' problems.

2. Intermediate Students - Approximately one-third of the participants are intermediate students (N-16). Nearly all of them attend the Centre more than 10 times yearly (N-13). They attend the Centre: to converse with francophones (N-13), to receive help (N-8) and to read French or listen to music (N-7). Another reason for their high level of attendance was that they found the atmosphere welcoming.

They heard about the Centre in the following ways: from friends (N-6), from the instructor (N-6), from monitors' visits (N-3).

Assessment:

Of the intermediate students who attended the lunch hour programs the majority would like them to continue or be expanded.

3. Advanced Students - These students are slightly less than 25% of the population (N-11). Nearly all of them attend more than 10 times yearly (N-9). Their main reasons for attending are: to converse with francophones (N-11), to get help (N-6), for books, music, etc. (N-4). They also come to meet other francophiles.

Assessment:

These students would like to see the noon hour program continued. They expressed concern over the amount of English heard.

4. Native Speakers and Bilingual Students - This group has increased significantly this year to nearly 10%. They come because of the welcoming atmosphere and to meet other francophiles. They also indicate an appreciation of the books, magazines and music.

B) General Comments based on the Questionnaires

1. Hours of the French Centre

In general (N-44) participants are satisfied with the present hours. Several indicated, however, that noon hour courses conflict with the Centre. Others, although basically satisfied, expressed the hope that on some days the Centre might be open in the afternoon.

2. Noon Hour Program

Although less than half (N-20) the participants attended the noon hour program, those who did wanted it to continue or be expanded. Several indicated that there was a lack of publicity.

It must be noted that the Centre was literally packed for some of the events. In the evaluator's opinion the program should continue. Publicity should be increased. Many students indicated that they would like to see films included (Appendix B).

3. Publicity

The administration should be aware that the best publicity comes from instructors and monitors visiting classes. The latter is part of the 1980 recommendations and should be continued. The "word-of-mouth", although not a Centre campaign, is also highly effective! As students

continue to be satisfied, this will increase.

It also appears that the written publicity is not particularly effective. The Director may want to evaluate it in the light of costs with a view to cancelling it.

4. Site and Facility

The location of the Centre appears to have little effect on the use of the facility.

There were numerous comments on the facility itself. As participation increases the facility appears to be small and crowded. Students also complain of the heat and lack of ventilation. It is strongly advised that the heat and ventilation problems be solved as soon as possible. They will become overriding problems as attendance remains high. Students may cease coming when the physical environment is not conducive.

At some time the Centre may want to look for new facilities. However, in the evaluator's opinion, this need not be undertaken in the near future - provided that the heat and ventilation problems can be remedied.

C) Assessment of Monitors

This is doubtless the area of greatest improvement. Students were overwhelming in their reaction to the welcoming atmosphere. This is the direct responsibility of the monitors.

The data from the questionnaire showed the following in regards to the monitors. Students checked two statements at most.

Made me feel welcome	28
Gave help willingly	31
Initiated conversation	18
Were not very helpful	0
Were not easily identifiable	3.

Nearly all questionnaires contained a written comment praising the monitors.

Of at least equal significance is the fact that most participants got to know the monitors (N-38) at the Centre itself. This is an indication of the positive role the monitors played in attracting and holding the high attendance at the Centre.

During observation periods the evaluator was most impressed by the ease, animation and warmth of the monitors.

There is one area in which monitors might be more diligent: speaking of English by participants. As the Centre is arranged in two conversational areas, it might be desirable to assign a monitor to each area.

D) Review of the Recommendations of 1980

1) Personnel

There were three recommendations made: that a job description be given, that an in-service be offered and that monitors wear name tags. All these were implemented. In the evaluator's opinion they have contributed to the success of the 1981 program.

2) Student Needs

It was recommended that a program be implemented to introduce students to the Centre. This was proven to be successful. In particular, beginners have come to the Centre because of the monitors' class visits.

3) Program

It was recommended that a program of cultural and grammatical elements be introduced. A series of cultural events has been given. It has proven successful and should be continued with more emphasis on

publicity. The demand for help with grammar was not shown in any of the questionnaires. It can be assumed that students received enough individual help to obviate any grammar program.

VI. Conclusion

In the evaluator's opinion the French Centre showed significant improvement in all areas. It has been exciting to see such growth. The Director and monitors are to be highly commended for their time and efforts.

Recommendations

It is recommended that:

1. the heating and ventilation of the Centre be remedied immediately;
2. consideration be given to including French films in the Centre's program ;
3. an accurate count be kept on a weekly basis.

APPENDICES

Appendix A Proposal given to Advanced Education and Manpower

Appendix B Participants' Questionnaire (résumé of results)

Statistics on Cross-tabulation of Questionnaire (available at the French Centre)

PROPOSAL TO THE DEPARTMENT OF ADVANCED EDUCATION AND MANPOWER

I. (a) NAME OF INSTITUTION: The University of Calgary

(b) CONTACT PERSON: Donna Mydlarski, 284-6827

(c) PROPOSED LOCATION OF PROJECT: French Centre, Calgary Hall C-301

(d) PROJECT TITLE: French Drop-In Centre

(e) AUTHORIZATION: _____

Dr. R. S. Chapman, Dean
Faculty of Continuing Education

II. OBJECTIVE OF THE PROJECT:

To provide an informal setting on the University of Calgary campus where students can meet with native French speakers and practice conversation skills, thereby constituting a valuable service to instructional programs both of a credit and non-credit nature.

III. CONTENT DESCRIPTION:

A French atmosphere is created by a variety of books, magazines, games and music from Quebec and other parts of "la francophonie". By its very nature, the Drop-In Centre complements the more structured type of language study as found in the classroom. The Drop-In Centre fosters oral communication skills, both listening and speaking, through conversation with people whose native tongue is French. Some communicative activities will be planned for beginners since they have difficulty conversing. In addition, activities such as films, poetry readings, slide shows and sing songs will be included in the 1980-81 program.

IV. TARGET POPULATION:

Students of French taking courses in the Faculty of Education, the Faculty of Continuing Education, the Department of Romance Studies, the French Centre, francophiles in general. Numbers are difficult to estimate. Average of 100 contacts per week. Interest and the motivation to improve one's French are the only requirements to participate.

V. FORMAT:

(a) TOTAL NUMBER OF CONTACT HOURS -
Open five days a week from:

11:00 - 14:00 (2 monitors on duty)
18:00 - 19:00 (1 monitor on duty)

These hours are subject to change.

(b) PROPOSED STARTING DATE - April 1, 1980

(c) TERMINATION DATE - March 31, 1981

VI. PERSONNEL:

Director: Donna Mydlarski, BEd, MA

Monitors: To be appointed from among instructors and French-speaking students on campus. They will be required to attend a training workshop on hosting and facilitating in which the role of the monitor will be discussed.

VII. EVALUATION:

The thrust of the evaluation will be formative. An external evaluator, Pat Klinck, will conduct several observations during the first three weeks of operation, after which she will review with the monitors the weaknessess perceived. Monitors will continue to meet with the Director at regular intervals to assess whether the strategies identified in the training workshop and in the follow-up session with P. Klinck are effective and what further changes, if any, should be implemented.

In March 1981, users will be surveyed by questionnaire to determine how the French Centre is perceived and whether the activities planned by the Centre (see III, above) helped participants achieve their personal linguistic goals. P. Klinck will prepare and administer the questionnaire and will write an evaluation report on the overall program of the Drop-In Centre. This will provide an outsider's view on whether the organizational changes implemented have been beneficial and, if so, to what extent.

As in the past, users will be asked to "log-in" to ensure an accurate account of names and numbers.

VIII. BUDGET (see attached sheet)

LE CENTRE FRANCAIS/FRENCH CENTRE

DROP-IN CENTRE QUESTIONNAIRE

Please complete all questions. All information provided is confidential and will be used for purposes of statistics for funding agencies, evaluation and improvement of our program.

1) What is your affiliation with the University?

a) Academic staff	2
b) Support staff	-
c) Student	48
d) Spouse of any of the above	-

2) In what faculty or department are you taking French this seminar?

a) French Centre	2
b) Department of Romance Studies	37
c) Faculty of Continuing Education	4
d) Faculty of Education	1
e) Not enrolled in a French course at present	4

3) What do you believe is your level of proficiency in the French language?

a) Beginner	12
b) Intermediate	16
c) Advanced	11
d) Bilingual	5
e) Native speaker	4

4) Please indicate how you learned of the French Drop-In Centre (check one only).

a) Newsletters, brochures	1
b) Posters	1
c) The Gauntlet	-
d) A friend	12
e) Your instructor	21
f) When monitors visited my French class	7
g) Other	6

5) How often do you come to the French Centre?

a) Less than 3 times a term	3
b) 3 to 10 times a term	6
c) More than 10 times a term	39

..../2

6) If your answer is "less than 3 times a term" (5a) indicate the major reason for this (check one only).

a)	Time demands	2
b)	Lack of personal contact (knew no one)	-
c)	Did not need help	-
d)	Atmosphere did not seem welcoming	-
e)	Inconvenient location	1
f)	Had enough other francophone contacts to maintain level of French	-

7) If your answer to question 5 is "more than 10 times a term", indicate the major reason for this (check one only).

a)	Knew monitors	3
b)	Came to see friends	9
c)	Needed help	4
d)	Atmosphere was welcoming	15
e)	Wanted to meet other Francophiles	9

8) Please state at most two major reasons for attending the Drop-In Centre.

a)	Books, magazines, newspapers, music	19
b)	The opportunity to converse with francophones	43
c)	Help with specific language problems	24
d)	To attend lunch hour activities (e.g. poetry reading, Quebec architecture)	-

9) a) Are the present French Centre hours satisfactory for you? Yes - 44 / No - 5

b) If no, please specify changes.

_____

_____

_____

10) This year there was a program of noon hour activities. Did you attend any of them?

Yes 20 No 30

If yes:

a) Would you like this to continue at present level? 10

b) Would you like the program expanded? 5

..../3

Selection of Answers from Written Comments
on Questionnaire

11) How did you get to know the monitors in charge?

a)	At the Centre	38
b)	During Immersion Weekends	6
c)	Had classes in common	1
d)	Some other situation	1

12) Check at most two of the following statements to describe the Drop-in Centre's monitors.

a)	Made me feel welcome	27
b)	Gave help willingly	31
c)	Initiated conversation	18
d)	Were not very helpful	0
e)	Monitors were not easily identifiable	2

13) What factor do you think contributes most to the success of the Drop-In Centre?

It is a nice place to eat lunch.

The enthusiastic and conscientious attributes of the monitors.

Open and willing atmosphere in which one can learn the language at their own pace.

Atmosphere and monitor.

Easy-going atmosphere, friendly people, warm room, lot of things to read and things to listen to.

14) What factor do you feel detracts most from the Drop-In Centre?

The French Centre is too hot.

Trop de monde (quelque fois) dans une trop petite place.

Not very good for beginners. The monitors are very helpful but trying to speak in French is sometimes frustrating. (I never have attended the beginning hours because of lack of time.)

Lack of publicity about it, e.g. noon hour activities.

15) If you attended last year, please state any significant changes in the Drop-In Centre.

Plus de monde.

16) Are there any other activities in French which you would like to see on campus and which the French Centre might initiate?

Sponsored trips to Paris during Christmas and Reading Week. I'm sure they would be successful.

More French films - more immersion weekends and days.

Just started coming to the Centre this term so I haven't seen all that does go on yet. Can't comment.

The main disadvantage is that the interest of the beginning students is very minimal if at all (many do not come).

Immersion evenings - Friday or Saturday nights. (I find it really hard to get away for a weekend.) Activities could include dances, pot luck suppers, Quebec cultural evenings, parties, etc. Thanks! The Centre's a really great place!

Thank you for your cooperation.

The University of Calgary
2920 24 AVE. N.W.
CALGARY, CANADA
T2N 1N4

Centre français/French Centre
Calgary Hall C-301

le 29 août 1980.

DESCRIPTION DU TRAVAIL DE MONITEUR.

1. Hôte(Hôtesse) du Centre Français:

   Souhaiter la bienvenue, se présenter, montrer les ressources du Centre, découvrir les besoins des étudiants.

2. Conversation:

   Mettre les étudiants à l'aise, les amener à parler, les encourager, être patient, mettre son language à la portée de l'étudiant, poser des questions auxquelles il faut répondre autrement que par oui ou par non.

3. Modèle du bon usage de la langue française:

   Donner le vocabulaire nécessaire, insister sur l'emploi continu du français, aider les étudiants à faire leurs exercices de classe ou dissertation sans pour autant négliger les autres, ne pas consacrer plus de 10 minutes par étudiant lorsqu'il y a 2 étudiants et plus au Centre.

4. Organisation des activités linguistiques et sociales (après consultation avec la directrice).

5. Entretien du Centre:

   Maintenir le Centre propre, faire le café.

DM/mb

SUMMER LANGUAGE BURSARY PROGRAM

May 19 - June 29, 1981

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY

INFORMATION

RENSEIGNEMENTS

PROGRAMME DE BOURSES - COURS D'ETE DE LANGUES SECONDES

du 19 mai au 29 juin 1981

L'UNIVERSITE DE CALGARY

Faculty of Continuing Education
Faculté de l'Education Permanente

OC 21

EVALUATION OF THE

DROP-IN CENTRE

FRENCH CENTRE

UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY

1980-81

by

P. Klinck

April 1981

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Methods of Evaluation	1
III.	Essential Elements of the Drop-In Centre	2
	A. Personnel	2
	B. Site	2
	C. Participants	3
IV.	Description of Activities	3
V.	Assessment	4
	A. Student Group	4
	B. General Comments Based on Questionnaires	6
	C. Assessment of Monitors	7
	D. Review of 1980 Recommendations	8
VI.	Conclusion	9
	Appendices	10

I. Introduction

The French Drop-In Centre has been in operation since 1976. A summative evaluation was done in 1979-80 by Ms. P. Klinck, external evaluator. At that time suggestions were made to improve the program. It was suggested therefore that the 1980-81 program be formative in nature. (See Appendix A)

Evaluation

The purposes of this evaluation are:

1) to observe monitors during their sessions as hosts at the Drop-In Centre;
2) to provide necessary feedback on their ability to carry out their role as host;
3) to monitor the implementation of recommended changes and their impact on the Drop-In Centre;
4) to assess student reaction to the Drop-In Centre programs by questionnaire;
5) to provide information to the French Centre for future funding from various agencies.

II. Methods of Evaluation

The evaluator was present during the noonhour session to observe the interactions of monitors and Drop-In Centre participants. These observations were to address the following questions: Are monitors initiating conversation? Are they essentially playing the role of hosts, i.e. welcoming students? Is French the language of communication? Is the atmosphere conducive to pleasant social conversation?

Students were required to sign a log book at the door. Although this is not a satisfactory method of obtaining the names of all participants, it is the basis for the distribution of questionnaires. One hundred questionnaires were distributed through the Centre and by mail. Fifty were returned. They were cross-tabulated to analyze participant reaction. A résumé of written comments has been included in Appendix B.

III. Essential Elements of the Drop-In Centre

A) Personnel

Eight francophone monitors were employed. Hours were assigned between 11:00 and 14:00, 18:00 and 19:00 . Some adjustments in hours assigned were made as it became apparent which monitors were best filling the role of host.

All monitors are native speakers. Only one monitor was retained from last year's monitors.

A pre-session in-service was designed to accomplish the following goals:

a) Hôte du Centre français

b) Animateur de la conversation

c) Matériel du Centre

d) Activités linguistiques et sociales

e) Animateur des mini-situations.

B) Site

The same site was used as last year. It is a pleasant room although students complained of heat and lack of ventilation (Appendix B).

C) Participants

Of the participants surveyed (based on the list of those who signed in) the majority are students (N-48). They come from the Department of Romance Studies (N-37). The majority is fairly evenly divided: beginners (N-12), intermediate (N-16), advanced (N-11) and bilingual (N-5). The majority attended more than 10 times a year (N-39).

They attend the French Centre for the following reasons: to converse with francophones (N-28), to get help with problems in French (N-21) and to listen to music or read French publications (N-18). Many students indicated two reasons for coming to the Centre.

IV. Description of Activities

There are no structured activities on a daily basis. Students come for varying periods of time. They speak with friends, professors and monitors. Some listen to music, read periodicals or do homework.

In response to last year's questionnaire, the administration offered some structured activities: a reading of Prévert poetry, a talk on Quebec architecture, a Christmas party and a "Crêpe" day. These were well attended.

The main language used is French. English is heard from time to time but not extensively (Appendix B, Question 14).

It is estimated that the attendance at the French Centre has doubled. As no daily count has been taken, in the evaluator's opinion this estimate is conservative. The Centre is often packed at lunch time. Students stand and chat in groups when seating is limited. The number of professors attending has also increased. It has become a place where students and professors sit and chat. One of the professors pointed out that the majority of professors now come to the Centre for coffee breaks and lunch

rather than going to the Staff Lounge. The Director has given serious thought to opening the Centre for more hours a day. The demand seems to back this.

The role of host as undertaken by this year's monitors has greatly improved. Those who attend the Centre more than 10 times indicate that the major reason is the welcoming atmosphere. Literally no one found that the atmosphere inhibited their attendance.

V. Assessment

In this section of the report, an assessment will be made of the Drop-In Centre. It will be based on: an analysis of the questionnaires, an assessment of the monitors based on observations and data and on review of the implementation of the recommendations of the 1980 Evaluation.

A) The Student Group

1. Beginners - There is a significant increase in the number of beginners over last year. This year they represent 25% of the participants. 75% attended more than 10 times during the year. Some came to see friends at the Centre. This seems to indicate that a group of beginners came to see the Centre as a meeting place. They also came to speak French and get help. 75% also attended the activities put on by the Centre.

They heard about the Centre in the following ways (in order of importance): from their instructor, from the monitors' class visit or from friends.

They described the monitors as: made me feel welcome (N-15), gave help willingly (N-12).

Assessment:

In the evaluator's opinion the increase in beginners attending is most gratifying. This group is often the most inhibited and therefore the hardest to include in parascholastic activities. The Drop-In Centre has broken through this reserve. This can be attributed to the effort put forth by the Director in several directions: the monitors' visits to all classes and the morning immersions for beginners. Equally significant is the role of the monitor who is seen by all beginners as a welcoming, friendly person. One can hypothesize that the initial in-service and the diligence of the Director have fostered an understanding of the beginners' problems.

2. Intermediate Students - Approximately one-third of the participants are intermediate students (N-16). Nearly all of them attend the Centre more than 10 times yearly (N-13). They attend the Centre: to converse with francophones (N-13), to receive help (N-8) and to read French or listen to music (N-7). Another reason for their high level of attendance was that they found the atmosphere welcoming.

They heard about the Centre in the following ways: from friends (N-6), from the instructor (N-6), from monitors' visits (N-3).

Assessment:

Of the intermediate students who attended the lunch hour programs the majority would like them to continue or be expanded.

3. Advanced Students - These students are slightly less than 25% of the population (N-11). Nearly all of them attend more than 10 times yearly (N-9). Their main reasons for attending are: to converse with francophones (N-11), to get help (N-6), for books, music, etc. (N-4). They also come to meet other francophiles.

Assessment:

These students would like to see the noon hour program continued. They expressed concern over the amount of English heard.

4. Native Speakers and Bilingual Students - This group has increased significantly this year to nearly 10%. They come because of the welcoming atmosphere and to meet other francophiles. They also indicate an appreciation of the books, magazines and music.

B) General Comments based on the Questionnaires

1. Hours of the French Centre

In general (N-44) participants are satisfied with the present hours. Several indicated, however, that noon hour courses conflict with the Centre. Others, although basically satisfied, expressed the hope that on some days the Centre might be open in the afternoon.

2. Noon Hour Program

Although less than half (N-20) the participants attended the noon hour program, those who did wanted it to continue or be expanded. Several indicated that there was a lack of publicity.

It must be noted that the Centre was literally packed for some of the events. In the evaluator's opinion the program should continue. Publicity should be increased. Many students indicated that they would like to see films included (Appendix B).

3. Publicity

The administration should be aware that the best publicity comes from instructors and monitors visiting classes. The latter is part of the 1980 recommendations and should be continued. The "word-of-mouth", although not a Centre campaign, is also highly effective! As students

continue to be satisfied, this will increase.

It also appears that the written publicity is not particularly effective. The Director may want to evaluate it in the light of costs with a view to cancelling it.

4. Site and Facility

The location of the Centre appears to have little effect on the use of the facility.

There were numerous comments on the facility itself. As participation increases the facility appears to be small and crowded. Students also complain of the heat and lack of ventilation. It is strongly advised that the heat and ventilation problems be solved as soon as possible. They will become overriding problems as attendance remains high. Students may cease coming when the physical environment is not conducive.

At some time the Centre may want to look for new facilities. However, in the evaluator's opinion, this need not be undertaken in the near future - provided that the heat and ventilation problems can be remedied.

C) Assessment of Monitors

This is doubtless the area of greatest improvement. Students were overwhelming in their reaction to the welcoming atmosphere. This is the direct responsibility of the monitors.

The data from the questionnaire showed the following in regards to the monitors. Students checked two statements at most.

Made me feel welcome	28
Gave help willingly	31
Initiated conversation	18
Were not very helpful	0
Were not easily identifiable	3.

Nearly all questionnaires contained a written comment praising the monitors.

Of at least equal significance is the fact that most participants got to know the monitors (N-38) at the Centre itself. This is an indication of the positive role the monitors played in attracting and holding the high attendance at the Centre.

During observation periods the evaluator was most impressed by the ease, animation and warmth of the monitors.

There is one area in which monitors might be more diligent: speaking of English by participants. As the Centre is arranged in two conversational areas, it might be desirable to assign a monitor to each area.

D) Review of the Recommendations of 1980

1) Personnel

There were three recommendations made: that a job description be given, that an in-service be offered and that monitors wear name tags. All these were implemented. In the evaluator's opinion they have contributed to the success of the 1981 program.

2) Student Needs

It was recommended that a program be implemented to introduce students to the Centre. This was proven to be successful. In particular, beginners have come to the Centre because of the monitors' class visits.

3) Program

It was recommended that a program of cultural and grammatical elements be introduced. A series of cultural events has been given. It has proven successful and should be continued with more emphasis on

publicity. The demand for help with grammar was not shown in any of the questionnaires. It can be assumed that students received enough individual help to obviate any grammar program.

VI. Conclusion

In the evaluator's opinion the French Centre showed significant improvement in all areas. It has been exciting to see such growth. The Director and monitors are to be highly commended for their time and efforts.

Recommendations

It is recommended that:

1. the heating and ventilation of the Centre be remedied immediately;
2. consideration be given to including French films in the Centre's program ;
3. an accurate count be kept on a weekly basis.

APPENDICES

Appendix A Proposal given to Advanced Education and Manpower

Appendix B Participants' Questionnaire (résumé of results)

Statistics on Cross-tabulation of Questionnaire (available at the French Centre)

PROPOSAL TO THE DEPARTMENT OF ADVANCED EDUCATION AND MANPOWER

I. (a) NAME OF INSTITUTION: The University of Calgary

(b) CONTACT PERSON: Donna Mydlarski, 284-6827

(c) PROPOSED LOCATION OF PROJECT: French Centre, Calgary Hall C-301

(d) PROJECT TITLE: French Drop-In Centre

(e) AUTHORIZATION:

Dr. R. S. Chapman, Dean
Faculty of Continuing Education

II. OBJECTIVE OF THE PROJECT:

To provide an informal setting on the University of Calgary campus where students can meet with native French speakers and practice conversation skills, thereby constituting a valuable service to instructional programs both of a credit and non-credit nature.

III. CONTENT DESCRIPTION:

A French atmosphere is created by a variety of books, magazines, games and music from Quebec and other parts of "la francophonie". By its very nature, the Drop-In Centre complements the more structured type of language study as found in the classroom. The Drop-In Centre fosters oral communication skills, both listening and speaking, through conversation with people whose native tongue is French. Some communicative activities will be planned for beginners since they have difficulty conversing. In addition, activities such as films, poetry readings, slide shows and sing songs will be included in the 1980-81 program.

IV. TARGET POPULATION:

Students of French taking courses in the Faculty of Education, the Faculty of Continuing Education, the Department of Romance Studies, the French Centre, francophiles in general. Numbers are difficult to estimate. Average of 100 contacts per week. Interest and the motivation to improve one's French are the only requirements to participate.

V. FORMAT:

(a) TOTAL NUMBER OF CONTACT HOURS -
Open five days a week from:

11:00 - 14:00 (2 monitors on duty)
18:00 - 19:00 (1 monitor on duty)

These hours are subject to change.

(b) PROPOSED STARTING DATE - April 1, 1980

(c) TERMINATION DATE - March 31, 1981

VI. PERSONNEL:

Director: Donna Mydlarski, BEd, MA

Monitors: To be appointed from among instructors and French-speaking students on campus. They will be required to attend a training workshop on hosting and facilitating in which the role of the monitor will be discussed.

VII. EVALUATION:

The thrust of the evaluation will be formative. An external evaluator, Pat Klinck, will conduct several observations during the first three weeks of operation, after which she will review with the monitors the weaknessess perceived. Monitors will continue to meet with the Director at regular intervals to assess whether the strategies identified in the training workshop and in the follow-up session with P. Klinck are effective and what further changes, if any, should be implemented.

In March 1981, users will be surveyed by questionnaire to determine how the French Centre is perceived and whether the activities planned by the Centre (see III, above) helped participants achieve their personal linguistic goals. P. Klinck will prepare and administer the questionnaire and will write an evaluation report on the overall program of the Drop-In Centre. This will provide an outsider's view on whether the organizational changes implemented have been beneficial and, if so, to what extent.

As in the past, users will be asked to "log-in" to ensure an accurate account of names and numbers.

VIII. BUDGET (see attached sheet)

LE CENTRE FRANCAIS/FRENCH CENTRE

DROP-IN CENTRE QUESTIONNAIRE

Please complete all questions. All information provided is confidential and will be used for purposes of statistics for funding agencies, evaluation and improvement of our program.

1) What is your affiliation with the University?

a) Academic staff 2
b) Support staff -
c) Student 48
d) Spouse of any of the above -

2) In what faculty or department are you taking French this seminar?

a) French Centre 2
b) Department of Romance Studies 37
c) Faculty of Continuing Education 4
d) Faculty of Education 1
e) Not enrolled in a French course at present 4

3) What do you believe is your level of proficiency in the French language?

a) Beginner 12
b) Intermediate 16
c) Advanced 11
d) Bilingual 5
e) Native speaker 4

4) Please indicate how you learned of the French Drop-In Centre (check one only).

a) Newsletters, brochures 1
b) Posters 1
c) The Gauntlet -
d) A friend 12
e) Your instructor 21
f) When monitors visited my French class 7
g) Other 6

5) How often do you come to the French Centre?

a) Less than 3 times a term 3
b) 3 to 10 times a term 6
c) More than 10 times a term 39

..../2

6) If your answer is "less than 3 times a term" (5a) indicate the major reason for this (check one only).

a)	Time demands	2
b)	Lack of personal contact (knew no one)	-
c)	Did not need help	-
d)	Atmosphere did not seem welcoming	-
e)	Inconvenient location	1
f)	Had enough other francophone contacts to maintain level of French	-

7) If your answer to question 5 is "more than 10 times a term", indicate the major reason for this (check one only).

a)	Knew monitors	3
b)	Came to see friends	9
c)	Needed help	4
d)	Atmosphere was welcoming	15
e)	Wanted to meet other Francophiles	9

8) Please state at most two major reasons for attending the Drop-In Centre.

a)	Books, magazines, newspapers, music	19
b)	The opportunity to converse with francophones	43
c)	Help with specific language problems	24
d)	To attend lunch hour activities (e.g. poetry reading, Quebec architecture)	-

9) a) Are the present French Centre hours satisfactory for you? Yes - 44 / No - 5

b) If no, please specify changes.

_____

_____

_____

10) This year there was a program of noon hour activities. Did you attend any of them?

Yes 20 No 30

If yes:

a) Would you like this to continue at present level? 10

b) Would you like the program expanded? 5

..../3

Selection of Answers from Written Comments
on Questionnaire

11) How did you get to know the monitors in charge?

a)	At the Centre	38
b)	During Immersion Weekends	6
c)	Had classes in common	1
d)	Some other situation	1

12) Check at most two of the following statements to describe the Drop-In Centre's monitors.

a)	Made me feel welcome	27
b)	Gave help willingly	31
c)	Initiated conversation	18
d)	Were not very helpful	0
e)	Monitors were not easily identifiable	2

13) What factor do you think contributes most to the success of the Drop-In Centre?

It is a nice place to eat lunch.

The enthusiastic and conscientious attributes of the monitors.

Open and willing atmosphere in which one can learn the language at their own pace.

Atmosphere and monitor.

Easy-going atmosphere, friendly people, warm room, lot of things to read and things to listen to.

14) What factor do you feel detracts most from the Drop-In Centre?

The French Centre is too hot.

Trop de monde (quelque fois) dans une trop petite place.

Not very good for beginners. The monitors are very helpful but trying to speak in French is sometimes frustrating. (I never have attended the beginning hours because of lack of time.)

Lack of publicity about it, e.g. noon hour activities.

15) If you attended last year, please state any significant changes in the Drop-In Centre.

Plus de monde.

16) Are there any other activities in French which you would like to see on campus and which the French Centre might initiate?

Sponsored trips to Paris during Christmas and Reading Week. I'm sure they would be successful.

More French films - more immersion weekends and days.

Just started coming to the Centre this term so I haven't seen all that does go on yet. Can't comment.

The main disadvantage is that the interest of the beginning students is very minimal if at all (many do not come).

Immersion evenings - Friday or Saturday nights. (I find it really hard to get away for a weekend.) Activities could include dances, pot luck suppers, Quebec cultural evenings, parties, etc. Thanks! The Centre's a really great place!

Thank you for your cooperation.

The University of Calgary
2920 24 AVE. N.W.
CALGARY, CANADA
T2N 1N4

Centre français/French Centre
Calgary Hall C-301

le 29 août 1980.

DESCRIPTION DU TRAVAIL DE MONITEUR.

1. Hôte(Hôtesse) du Centre Français:

   Souhaiter la bienvenue, se présenter, montrer les ressources du Centre, découvrir les besoins des étudiants.

2. Conversation:

   Mettre les étudiants à l'aise, les amener à parler, les encourager, être patient, mettre son language à la portée de l'étudiant, poser des questions auxquelles il faut répondre autrement que par oui ou par non.

3. Modèle du bon usage de la langue française:

   Donner le vocabulaire nécessaire, insister sur l'emploi continu du français, aider les étudiants à faire leurs exercices de classe ou dissertation sans pour autant négliger les autres, ne pas consacrer plus de 10 minutes par étudiant lorsqu'il y a 2 étudiants et plus au Centre.

4. Organisation des activités linguistiques et sociales (après consultation avec la directrice).

5. Entretien du Centre:

   Maintenir le Centre propre, faire le café.

DM/mb

EVALUATION OF THE

DROP-IN CENTRE

FRENCH CENTRE

UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY

1980-81

by

P. Klinck

April 1981

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Methods of Evaluation	1
III.	Essential Elements of the Drop-In Centre	2
	A. Personnel	2
	B. Site	2
	C. Participants	3
IV.	Description of Activities	3
V.	Assessment	4
	A. Student Group	4
	B. General Comments Based on Questionnaires	6
	C. Assessment of Monitors	7
	D. Review of 1980 Recommendations	8
VI.	Conclusion	9
	Appendices	10

I. Introduction

The French Drop-In Centre has been in operation since 1976. A summative evaluation was done in 1979-80 by Ms. P. Klinck, external evaluator. At that time suggestions were made to improve the program. It was suggested therefore that the 1980-81 program be formative in nature. (See Appendix A)

Evaluation

The purposes of this evaluation are:

1) to observe monitors during their sessions as hosts at the Drop-In Centre;
2) to provide necessary feedback on their ability to carry out their role as host;
3) to monitor the implementation of recommended changes and their impact on the Drop-In Centre;
4) to assess student reaction to the Drop-In Centre programs by questionnaire;
5) to provide information to the French Centre for future funding from various agencies.

II. Methods of Evaluation

The evaluator was present during the noonhour session to observe the interactions of monitors and Drop-In Centre participants. These observations were to address the following questions: Are monitors initiating conversation? Are they essentially playing the role of hosts, i.e. welcoming students? Is French the language of communication? Is the atmosphere conducive to pleasant social conversation?

Students were required to sign a log book at the door. Although this is not a satisfactory method of obtaining the names of all participants, it is the basis for the distribution of questionnaires. One hundred questionnaires were distributed through the Centre and by mail. Fifty were returned. They were cross-tabulated to analyze participant reaction. A résumé of written comments has been included in Appendix B.

III. Essential Elements of the Drop-In Centre

A) Personnel

Eight francophone monitors were employed. Hours were assigned between 11:00 and 14:00, 18:00 and 19:00 . Some adjustments in hours assigned were made as it became apparent which monitors were best filling the role of host.

All monitors are native speakers. Only one monitor was retained from last year's monitors.

A pre-session in-service was designed to accomplish the following goals:

a) Hôte du Centre français

b) Animateur de la conversation

c) Matériel du Centre

d) Activités linguistiques et sociales

e) Animateur des mini-situations.

B) Site

The same site was used as last year. It is a pleasant room although students complained of heat and lack of ventilation (Appendix B).

C) Participants

Of the participants surveyed (based on the list of those who signed in) the majority are students (N-48). They come from the Department of Romance Studies (N-37). The majority is fairly evenly divided: beginners (N-12), intermediate (N-16), advanced (N-11) and bilingual (N-5). The majority attended more than 10 times a year (N-39).

They attend the French Centre for the following reasons: to converse with francophones (N-28), to get help with problems in French (N-21) and to listen to music or read French publications (N-18). Many students indicated two reasons for coming to the Centre.

IV. Description of Activities

There are no structured activities on a daily basis. Students come for varying periods of time. They speak with friends, professors and monitors. Some listen to music, read periodicals or do homework.

In response to last year's questionnaire, the administration offered some structured activities: a reading of Prévert poetry, a talk on Quebec architecture, a Christmas party and a "Crêpe" day. These were well attended.

The main language used is French. English is heard from time to time but not extensively (Appendix B, Question 14).

It is estimated that the attendance at the French Centre has doubled. As no daily count has been taken, in the evaluator's opinion this estimate is conservative. The Centre is often packed at lunch time. Students stand and chat in groups when seating is limited. The number of professors attending has also increased. It has become a place where students and professors sit and chat. One of the professors pointed out that the majority of professors now come to the Centre for coffee breaks and lunch

rather than going to the Staff Lounge. The Director has given serious thought to opening the Centre for more hours a day. The demand seems to back this.

The role of host as undertaken by this year's monitors has greatly improved. Those who attend the Centre more than 10 times indicate that the major reason is the welcoming atmosphere. Literally no one found that the atmosphere inhibited their attendance.

V. Assessment

In this section of the report, an assessment will be made of the Drop-In Centre. It will be based on: an analysis of the questionnaires, an assessment of the monitors based on observations and data and on review of the implementation of the recommendations of the 1980 Evaluation.

A) The Student Group

1. Beginners - There is a significant increase in the number of beginners over last year. This year they represent 25% of the participants. 75% attended more than 10 times during the year. Some came to see friends at the Centre. This seems to indicate that a group of beginners came to see the Centre as a meeting place. They also came to speak French and get help. 75% also attended the activities put on by the Centre.

They heard about the Centre in the following ways (in order of importance): from their instructor, from the monitors' class visit or from friends.

They described the monitors as: made me feel welcome (N-15), gave help willingly (N-12).

Assessment:

In the evaluator's opinion the increase in beginners attending is most gratifying. This group is often the most inhibited and therefore the hardest to include in parascholastic activities. The Drop-In Centre has broken through this reserve. This can be attributed to the effort put forth by the Director in several directions: the monitors' visits to all classes and the morning immersions for beginners. Equally significant is the role of the monitor who is seen by all beginners as a welcoming, friendly person. One can hypothesize that the initial in-service and the diligence of the Director have fostered an understanding of the beginners' problems.

2. Intermediate Students - Approximately one-third of the participants are intermediate students (N-16). Nearly all of them attend the Centre more than 10 times yearly (N-13). They attend the Centre: to converse with francophones (N-13), to receive help (N-8) and to read French or listen to music (N-7). Another reason for their high level of attendance was that they found the atmosphere welcoming.

They heard about the Centre in the following ways: from friends (N-6), from the instructor (N-6), from monitors' visits (N-3).

Assessment:

Of the intermediate students who attended the lunch hour programs the majority would like them to continue or be expanded.

3. Advanced Students - These students are slightly less than 25% of the population (N-11). Nearly all of them attend more than 10 times yearly (N-9). Their main reasons for attending are: to converse with francophones (N-11), to get help (N-6), for books, music, etc. (N-4). They also come to meet other francophiles.

Assessment:

These students would like to see the noon hour program continued. They expressed concern over the amount of English heard.

4. Native Speakers and Bilingual Students - This group has increased significantly this year to nearly 10%. They come because of the welcoming atmosphere and to meet other francophiles. They also indicate an appreciation of the books, magazines and music.

B) General Comments based on the Questionnaires

1. Hours of the French Centre

In general (N-44) participants are satisfied with the present hours. Several indicated, however, that noon hour courses conflict with the Centre. Others, although basically satisfied, expressed the hope that on some days the Centre might be open in the afternoon.

2. Noon Hour Program

Although less than half (N-20) the participants attended the noon hour program, those who did wanted it to continue or be expanded. Several indicated that there was a lack of publicity.

It must be noted that the Centre was literally packed for some of the events. In the evaluator's opinion the program should continue. Publicity should be increased. Many students indicated that they would like to see films included (Appendix B).

3. Publicity

The administration should be aware that the best publicity comes from instructors and monitors visiting classes. The latter is part of the 1980 recommendations and should be continued. The "word-of-mouth", although not a Centre campaign, is also highly effective! As students

continue to be satisfied, this will increase.

It also appears that the written publicity is not particularly effective. The Director may want to evaluate it in the light of costs with a view to cancelling it.

4. Site and Facility

The location of the Centre appears to have little effect on the use of the facility.

There were numerous comments on the facility itself. As participation increases the facility appears to be small and crowded. Students also complain of the heat and lack of ventilation. It is strongly advised that the heat and ventilation problems be solved as soon as possible. They will become overriding problems as attendance remains high. Students may cease coming when the physical environment is not conducive.

At some time the Centre may want to look for new facilities. However, in the evaluator's opinion, this need not be undertaken in the near future - provided that the heat and ventilation problems can be remedied.

C) Assessment of Monitors

This is doubtless the area of greatest improvement. Students were overwhelming in their reaction to the welcoming atmosphere. This is the direct responsibility of the monitors.

The data from the questionnaire showed the following in regards to the monitors. Students checked two statements at most.

Made me feel welcome	28
Gave help willingly	31
Initiated conversation	18
Were not very helpful	0
Were not easily identifiable	3.

Nearly all questionnaires contained a written comment praising the monitors.

Of at least equal significance is the fact that most participants got to know the monitors (N-38) at the Centre itself. This is an indication of the positive role the monitors played in attracting and holding the high attendance at the Centre.

During observation periods the evaluator was most impressed by the ease, animation and warmth of the monitors.

There is one area in which monitors might be more diligent: speaking of English by participants. As the Centre is arranged in two conversational areas, it might be desirable to assign a monitor to each area.

D) Review of the Recommendations of 1980

1) Personnel

There were three recommendations made: that a job description be given, that an in-service be offered and that monitors wear name tags. All these were implemented. In the evaluator's opinion they have contributed to the success of the 1981 program.

2) Student Needs

It was recommended that a program be implemented to introduce students to the Centre. This was proven to be successful. In particular, beginners have come to the Centre because of the monitors' class visits.

3) Program

It was recommended that a program of cultural and grammatical elements be introduced. A series of cultural events has been given. It has proven successful and should be continued with more emphasis on

publicity. The demand for help with grammar was not shown in any of the questionnaires. It can be assumed that students received enough individual help to obviate any grammar program.

VI. Conclusion

In the evaluator's opinion the French Centre showed significant improvement in all areas. It has been exciting to see such growth. The Director and monitors are to be highly commended for their time and efforts.

Recommendations

It is recommended that:

1. the heating and ventilation of the Centre be remedied immediately;
2. consideration be given to including French films in the Centre's program ;
3. an accurate count be kept on a weekly basis.

APPENDICES

Appendix A Proposal given to Advanced Education and Manpower

Appendix B Participants' Questionnaire (résumé of results)

Statistics on Cross-tabulation of Questionnaire (available at the French Centre)

PROPOSAL TO THE DEPARTMENT OF ADVANCED EDUCATION AND MANPOWER

I. (a) NAME OF INSTITUTION: The University of Calgary

(b) CONTACT PERSON: Donna Mydlarski, 284-6827

(c) PROPOSED LOCATION OF PROJECT: French Centre, Calgary Hall C-301

(d) PROJECT TITLE: French Drop-In Centre

(e) AUTHORIZATION: _____

Dr. R. S. Chapman, Dean
Faculty of Continuing Education

II. OBJECTIVE OF THE PROJECT:

To provide an informal setting on the University of Calgary campus where students can meet with native French speakers and practice conversation skills, thereby constituting a valuable service to instructional programs both of a credit and non-credit nature.

III. CONTENT DESCRIPTION:

A French atmosphere is created by a variety of books, magazines, games and music from Quebec and other parts of "la francophonie". By its very nature, the Drop-In Centre complements the more structured type of language study as found in the classroom. The Drop-In Centre fosters oral communication skills, both listening and speaking, through conversation with people whose native tongue is French. Some communicative activities will be planned for beginners since they have difficulty conversing. In addition, activities such as films, poetry readings, slide shows and sing songs will be included in the 1980-81 program.

IV. TARGET POPULATION:

Students of French taking courses in the Faculty of Education, the Faculty of Continuing Education, the Department of Romance Studies, the French Centre, francophiles in general. Numbers are difficult to estimate. Average of 100 contacts per week. Interest and the motivation to improve one's French are the only requirements to participate.

V. FORMAT:

(a) TOTAL NUMBER OF CONTACT HOURS -
Open five days a week from:

11:00 - 14:00 (2 monitors on duty)
18:00 - 19:00 (1 monitor on duty)

These hours are subject to change.

(b) PROPOSED STARTING DATE - April 1, 1980

(c) TERMINATION DATE - March 31, 1981

VI. PERSONNEL:

Director: Donna Mydlarski, BEd, MA

Monitors: To be appointed from among instructors and French-speaking students on campus. They will be required to attend a training workshop on hosting and facilitating in which the role of the monitor will be discussed.

VII. EVALUATION:

The thrust of the evaluation will be formative. An external evaluator, Pat Klinck, will conduct several observations during the first three weeks of operation, after which she will review with the monitors the weaknessess perceived. Monitors will continue to meet with the Director at regular intervals to assess whether the strategies identified in the training workshop and in the follow-up session with P. Klinck are effective and what further changes, if any, should be implemented.

In March 1981, users will be surveyed by questionnaire to determine how the French Centre is perceived and whether the activities planned by the Centre (see III, above) helped participants achieve their personal linguistic goals. P. Klinck will prepare and administer the questionnaire and will write an evaluation report on the overall program of the Drop-In Centre. This will provide an outsider's view on whether the organizational changes implemented have been beneficial and, if so, to what extent.

As in the past, users will be asked to "log-in" to ensure an accurate account of names and numbers.

VIII. BUDGET (see attached sheet)

LE CENTRE FRANCAIS/FRENCH CENTRE

DROP-IN CENTRE QUESTIONNAIRE

Please complete all questions. All information provided is confidential and will be used for purposes of statistics for funding agencies, evaluation and improvement of our program.

1) What is your affiliation with the University?

a) Academic staff	2
b) Support staff	-
c) Student	48
d) Spouse of any of the above	-

2) In what faculty or department are you taking French this seminar?

a) French Centre	2
b) Department of Romance Studies	37
c) Faculty of Continuing Education	4
d) Faculty of Education	1
e) Not enrolled in a French course at present	4

3) What do you believe is your level of proficiency in the French language?

a) Beginner	12
b) Intermediate	16
c) Advanced	11
d) Bilingual	5
e) Native speaker	4

4) Please indicate how you learned of the French Drop-In Centre (check one only).

a) Newsletters, brochures	1
b) Posters	1
c) The Gauntlet	-
d) A friend	12
e) Your instructor	21
f) When monitors visited my French class	7
g) Other	6

5) How often do you come to the French Centre?

a) Less than 3 times a term	3
b) 3 to 10 times a term	6
c) More than 10 times a term	39

..../2

6) If your answer is "less than 3 times a term" (5a) indicate the major reason for this (check one only).

a)	Time demands	2
b)	Lack of personal contact (knew no one)	-
c)	Did not need help	-
d)	Atmosphere did not seem welcoming	-
e)	Inconvenient location	1
f)	Had enough other francophone contacts to maintain level of French	-

7) If your answer to question 5 is "more than 10 times a term", indicate the major reason for this (check one only).

a)	Knew monitors	3
b)	Came to see friends	9
c)	Needed help	4
d)	Atmosphere was welcoming	15
e)	Wanted to meet other Francophiles	9

8) Please state at most two major reasons for attending the Drop-In Centre.

a)	Books, magazines, newspapers, music	19
b)	The opportunity to converse with francophones	43
c)	Help with specific language problems	24
d)	To attend lunch hour activities (e.g. poetry reading, Quebec architecture)	-

9) a) Are the present French Centre hours satisfactory for you? Yes - 44 / No - 5

b) If no, please specify changes.

_____

_____

_____

10) This year there was a program of noon hour activities. Did you attend any of them?

Yes 20 No 30

If yes:

a) Would you like this to continue at present level? 10

b) Would you like the program expanded? 5

..../3

Selection of Answers from Written Comments
on Questionnaire

11) How did you get to know the monitors in charge?

a)	At the Centre	38
b)	During Immersion Weekends	6
c)	Had classes in common	1
d)	Some other situation	1

12) Check <u>at most</u> two of the following statements to describe the Drop-in Centre's monitors.

a)	Made me feel welcome	27
b)	Gave help willingly	31
c)	Initiated conversation	18
d)	Were not very helpful	0
e)	Monitors were not easily identifiable	2

13) What factor do you think contributes most to the success of the Drop-In Centre?

It is a nice place to eat lunch.

The enthusiastic and conscientious attributes of the monitors.

Open and willing atmosphere in which one can learn the language at their own pace.

Atmosphere and monitor.

Easy-going atmosphere, friendly people, warm room, lot of things to read and things to listen to.

14) What factor do you feel detracts most from the Drop-In Centre?

The French Centre is too hot.

Trop de monde (quelque fois) dans une trop petite place.

Not very good for beginners. The monitors are very helpful but trying to speak in French is sometimes frustrating. (I never have attended the beginning hours because of lack of time.)

Lack of publicity about it, e.g. noon hour activities.

15) If you attended last year, please state any significant changes in the Drop-In Centre.

Plus de monde.

16) Are there any other activities in French which you would like to see on campus and which the French Centre might initiate?

Sponsored trips to Paris during Christmas and Reading Week. I'm sure they would be successful.

More French films - more immersion weekends and days.

Just started coming to the Centre this term so I haven't seen all that does go on yet. Can't comment.

The main disadvantage is that the interest of the beginning students is very minimal if at all (many do not come).

Immersion evenings - Friday or Saturday nights. (I find it really hard to get away for a weekend.) Activities could include dances, pot luck suppers, Quebec cultural evenings, parties, etc. Thanks! The Centre's a really great place!

Thank you for your cooperation.

The University of Calgary
2920 24 AVE. N.W.
CALGARY, CANADA
T2N 1N4

Centre français/French Centre
Calgary Hall C-301

le 29 août 1980.

DESCRIPTION DU TRAVAIL DE MONITEUR.

1. Hôte(Hôtesse) du Centre Français:

   Souhaiter la bienvenue, se présenter, montrer les ressources du Centre, découvrir les besoins des étudiants.

2. Conversation:

   Mettre les étudiants à l'aise, les amener à parler, les encourager, être patient, mettre son language à la portée de l'étudiant, poser des questions auxquelles il faut répondre autrement que par oui ou par non.

3. Modèle du bon usage de la langue française:

   Donner le vocabulaire nécessaire, insister sur l'emploi continu du français, aider les étudiants à faire leurs exercices de classe ou dissertation sans pour autant négliger les autres, ne pas consacrer plus de 10 minutes par étudiant lorsqu'il y a 2 étudiants et plus au Centre.

4. Organisation des activités linguistiques et sociales (après consultation avec la directrice).

5. Entretien du Centre:

   Maintenir le Centre propre, faire le café.

DM/mb

EVALUATION OF THE

IMMERSION WEEKENDS

FRENCH CENTRE

UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY

1980-81

by

P. Klinck

April 1981

Table of Contents

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	EVALUATION	1
	A. Purpose of the Evaluation	1
	B. Evaluation Strategy and Instruments	2
	C. Observation and Participation	3
III.	ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF THE TWO WEEKENDS OBSERVED	3
	A. Target Group	3
	B. Instructional Staff	3
	C. Site	4
IV.	DESCRIPTION AND ASSESSMENT OF SEPTEMBER 27	5
	A. Cultural Theme	5
	B. Assessment	5
	1) Correction Grid	6
	2) Non-Verbal Behaviour	7
	C. Types of Questions	9
V.	INTERVENTION IN-SERVICE	10
	A. Timing and Style of the Presentation	10
	B. Content and Method of Presentation	11
VI.	OBSERVATION OF THE NOVEMBER 14 WEEKEND	13
	A. Corrections	13
	B. Non-Verbal Behaviour	13
	C. Use of Question Techniques	13

Page

VII. FOLLOW-UP SESSION 14

VIII. REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 1980 RECOMMENDATIONS 15

1) Timing of the Weekends 15

2) Variation of Themes 15

3) Monitor In-Service and Selection of Candidates 15

CONCLUSION 17

APPENDICES 18

I. INTRODUCTION

In September 1979 a joint meeting of Mrs. D. Mydlarski, Director of the French Centre (University of Calgary) and Advanced Education and Manpower (Government of Alberta) decided to evaluate the University's projects funded by Special Projects. An external evaluation was presented in May 1980 of the Drop-In Centre and the Immersion Weekends. This was a summative evaluation.

In consultation with Ms. P. Klinck, external evaluator, Mrs. Mydlarski proposed that an evaluation be undertaken for the 1980-81 scholastic year (September to April). As suggested in the 1980 Report, this evaluation was to be formative, focusing on the crucial role of the monitor. It was based on the following plan:

a) An initial observation of a weekend.

b) An intervention in-service.

c) A second weekend evaluation.

d) De-briefing session. (Appendix A)

Although the recommendations of the 1980 Report were not extensive, the evaluator deemed it worthy that their implementation should be verified and any effect on the weekends observed.

II. EVALUATION

A. Purpose of the Evaluation

The purposes of this evaluation are:

1. To provide an analysis of the monitor's role during the first weekend.
2. To describe the intervention in-service given to

monitors on their role.

3. To observe and analyse the effects of the in-service on the monitors' ability to handle their role in a subsequent weekend.
4. To determine to what extent the 1980 recommendations have been implemented and what effect they have had on immersion weekends.
5. To provide the French Centre with further recommendations for the Immersion Weekend program.

As in the 1980 Report, the thrust of this evaluation will be description, analysis and assessment of outcomes. The outcomes are not changes in student linguistic behaviour. Rather the outcomes are: heightened appreciation of the French language and the complex nature of communication. We have already determined that the format of activities follows the best of second language teaching principles and that the climate of the weekends is conducive to spontaneous use of French. What is to be determined is how improvements in the monitors' role can in fact enhance the oral production of students.

B. Evaluation Strategy and Instruments

The following instruments were developed to categorize and systematize observations and to give the assurance of the objectives and consistency of data. They deal exclusively with the role of the monitor.

1. Chart for observing non-verbal action.
2. Chart for evaluating question techniques.

3. Classification of Corrections. (Appendix B)

C. Observation and Participation

To ensure that the climate of spontaneity and enjoyment was not marred by the presence of an "evaluator-inspector", the evaluator took part in the weekends. She was also involved in giving in-service - this allowed for and encouraged a feeling of collegiality with the monitors. Furthermore, students remembered the evaluator from last year. They were open and at ease with the evaluator.

Observation was done within the following framework: how did the monitors foster a good rapport with students, what was the nature of the correcting process, what was the level of skill in questioning techniques.

The observation schedule was as follows:

Sept. 27-28 - Sat. from 8:30 - 3:30. Initially the evaluator was to observe the second weekend (Oct. 14-15). This was unfortunately impossible.

Nov. 15-16 - Sat. 2:30 p.m. to Sunday 2:30 p.m.

III. ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF THE TWO WEEKENDS OBSERVED

A. Target Group

In the first weekend 16 participants were involved. In the second weekend, the enrollment had increased to 30.

B. Instructional Staff

There was a small group of monitors - six in all, chosen from an initial group of nine. Competition was very stiff. A core of four

Québecoises were chosen. They were present at most weekends. Although all four were women, and the Centre would have preferred a better balance, no problems seemed to arise. Two male monitors were available for substitution or when numbers demanded.

Although the nature of the monitor's role did not change, the leadership did. Rather than no leader or an appointed one, the Centre rotated the leadership among the four main monitors. This proved to be highly effective. (See Appendix C)

All monitors took the pre-session in-services (see Appendix A) and the intervention in-service. The in-service program was part of the recommendations from the last evaluation.

C. Site

As concern was expressed last year about the quality of the food and the lack of typical French food, consideration was given to changing sites. The first weekend was held in Yamnuska Centre as last year.

The second, and all subsequent weekends, were held at Silver Creek Ranch. Silver Creek Ranch is located approximately 92 kilometres from Calgary. It is in the foothills near a small town. It is an excellent area for horse back riding, hiking and skiing. There is a two-storey log building which serves as a dining centre and large meeting area. It has a large wood-burning fireplace. Nearby are several log buildings which each have dormitories and a large area which allow for full group activities. Near the central area are trails leading to several other log cabins which may be used as alternatives

for group activities.

The personnel, the Roessingh family, all possess some command of French. Equally important is the fact that they will adapt their menus to serve French food: croissants, ratatouille, quiche, etc.

Assessment: In the evaluator's opinion the change of sites was an excellent idea. The Roessingh family is hospitable. There was always tea or coffee and cookies available. They made a consistent effort to speak French to participants.

The main building is conducive to sitting near the fire and chatting. Although the dormitory buildings are basically less inviting, the monitors worked hard at decorating them with posters and signs in French. One had the impression of being in a French-speaking area!

IV. DESCRIPTION AND ASSESSMENT OF SEPTEMBER 27

A. Cultural Theme

In keeping with last year's recommendation, the theme of this weekend was new: le 75ième Anniversaire de l'Alberta. Monitors had shown initiative, creativity and hard work in setting up the various activities.

B. Assessment

The purpose of the evaluation this weekend was specific. Observations were noted based on the following: correction grid, types of questions, non-verbal behaviour.

1) Correction Grid

One of the goals of the weekend is spontaneous and natural use of French; the question of correction is a philosophical one. One may ask if correction is necessary, how and when correction should be done, what effect correction has on the student.

In the evaluator's opinion the method of correction is a vital one in the establishing of a good climate. Too much correction, too soon establishes a fear of failure. Furthermore, it inhibits spontaneity even among the most confident. It is self-evident, however, that some errors destroy meaningful communcations.

Types of Corrections	Ways of Correcting	When Does Correction Start?
- pronunciation	- paraphrasing	- at the very first?
- syntax	- "zeroing in"	- during meals?
- tenses	- repetition	- at pre-arranged times?
- vocabulary		

Is it used when critical? Has meaning been lost?

Is correction done in large groups? One-on-one?

Assessment

In general monitors did not tend to over-correct. They were fairly consistent in correcting the most severe errors of grammar and vocabulary. Errors in pronunciations and intonation were wisely ignored unless they inhibited understanding.

Only two techniques were used for correction: direct correction (grammar) and definition and example (vocabulary). Correction was done

in large group as well as small group situations.

It is interesting to note that one of the first games, "Jeu de l'étiquette" dealt with the difference between masculine and feminine adjectives. This was an excellent choice. Students tended to do well. The obvious danger is the temptation to correct the errors - which in fact are relatively insignificant.

The monitors resisted this temptation. It was gratifying to note that several students were capable of self-monitoring.

2) Non-Verbal Behaviour

The instrument used for collecting observations allowed the evaluator to look at a variety of factors which enhance rapport.

For each category there were key words or questions to direct the evaluator. This ensured a degree of objectivity.

Use of Gestures - positives - open arms, hands, etc.
- stance
- nodding
- ease of movement
- to explain meaning

- negatives - rigidly in one spot
- folded arms
- aggressive stance

Facial Expressions - smiles, laughs, warmth

Eye Contact - inclusion of all students
- looks at each individual
- looks at individual while talking to him

(cont'd)

Voice Tone - clarity
- projection
- variations
- pace, speed
- laughter

Movement - figé?
- easy movement among students
- too much movement, agitated

Assessment

a) Eye Contact. The monitors tended to have good eye contact. They used eye contact to include students. They kept an eye on retiring, timid students and encouraged them by addressing comments to them.

The monitors had chosen the circle for a seating arrangement. This form is conducive to discussion. They were alerted to the problem of eye contact with students on either side of them.

b) Voice Quality. In general, monitors showed good voice control and projection. They seemed, however, unaware of pace and variation of volume. There was a lot of laughter and a general feeling of ease.

c) Gestures. This group of monitors was very strong in their use of gestures. They used gestures which showed ease, warmth, expansiveness and a desire to include everyone. They possessed a good use of mime to explain meaning.

d) Facial Expressions. They were a smiling, friendly-appearing group. Although the first weekend is fairly stressful, they always looked at ease and conveyed a sense of enjoyment.

e) Movement among Groups. None of them appeared to be unable to move from one group to another. In so doing they managed to be near different people. This contributed to a cohesive feeling and to a sense of participation.

C. Types of Questions

The instrument used to collect this data is based on "Questioning Skills".* This division of questions was chosen among many. It has the advantage of being simple and straightforward. As the monitors are not education students and as the in-service time was limited, practicality was of prime importance. The categories used allow students to concentrate on a few forms.

a) The category of fluency was established because to speak fluently one must ask many questions. The great majority of questions fall into the category of factual or descriptive. They call upon memory.

b) Probing questions. These questions demand that a student goes deeper for an answer. He must explain, justify, or hypothesize.

c) High order questions. One must think or reflect. For example, an answer might be based on personal values, a comparison of ideas, or a problem to be solved.

d) Divergent questions. In this category there are no right or wrong questions, only creative, imaginative ones. A student may be

---

*P. Allen, K. Ryan, Robert Bush and J. Cooper, Teaching Skills for Secondary Teachers (General Learning Corporation, 1969).

asked his reactions to a hypothetical question or to brainstorm, etc.

Assessment

The majority of questions asked fell into the fluency category. They relied heavily on memory (e.g., of the slide presentation). Many of the questions could be answered by yes or no.

Literally all the questions were asked by the monitor in the large group sessions. Some of the games required that students question each other in small groups.

Monitors tended to fall back on lecture-style presentations, a form which works well for advanced information processing. However, the goal of an immersion is student oral production!

Monitors were also ill at ease with "long" silences. These silences tended to follow the higher forms of questions. It is, of course, understandable that second language learners take longer with these answers. It is equally understandable that the monitors, faced with a "long" silence, answered their own questions!

In conclusion, this situation was not as conducive to oral exchange and student-directed talk as the monitors would have liked it to be.

V. INTERVENTION IN-SERVICE

A. Timing and Style of the Presentation

It has been decided that the intervention in-service would follow the September 27 observation periods. Due to a situation beyond the control of the evaluator, the in-service was not given until October 27.

The evaluator was most desirous to maintain a high degree of collegiality with the monitors. It was decided therefore to have a supper meeting. The evaluator also decided that the in-service would be conducted in several modes:

1) reaction panel

2) small group discussion

3) hands-on work (questions, exercises)

4) a strict minimum of information-giving.

These methods are also highly desirable as the in-service was directed to adults who, like their students, had experience in learning a second language.

B. Content and Method of Presentation

The following plan gives a summary of the areas of discussion, the goals of each area, the time spent and the activity engaged in by the monitors and the evaluator. The atmosphere was very informal. Questions and reactions were encouraged by monitors and evaluator alike.

Approx. Time	Area of Discussion and Goals of Discussion	Activity: Student	Activity: Evaluator
5:00	Introduction - review of 1980 report - review of evaluator's role	listening	presentation
5:10	Linguistic Autobiography - goal: self-awareness, i.e., an adult learning a second language	exchange based on questions which delved into the monitors' experiences with learning a second language	
5:35	Use of Non-Verbals: - goal: self-awareness, analysis of how to create an atmosphere by use of non-verbals	in groups of two, students work through the handout (Appendix D, I) and present by mime and actions	
5:40	Corrections - goals: self-awareness and awareness of student reactions. Control over the instinct to correct	exchange of ideas on the philosophy and practise of corrections	
6:00	The Good Second Language Learner - H.H. Stern	note-taking	presentation of research
6:20	Question Techniques - goal: to present different categories of questions to make students aware of the importance of questions to use the category of question and design: - questions to ask students - real situations in which students must use the category of question	listening writing a critique of questions (Appendix D, 2) and discussing them using a picture to ask as many fluency questions as possible exercise on probing questions exercise to change factual questions to higher order exercise to make divergent questions	listening and comparing
7:00	What inhibits good questions and answers, and how to solve the problem	listening, note-taking	presentation
7:30	How to self-evaluate your weekend immersions	note-taking	presentation on blackboard

12.

VI. OBSERVATION OF THE NOVEMBER 14 WEEKEND

A. Corrections

There were substantially fewer corrections in which the monitor zeroed in on one error. They allowed errors which did not affect meaning to pass.

Where necessary, errors in vocabulary were corrected by using definition, examples, synonyms and antonyms.

Some endeavour was made to re-phrase or paraphrase sentences in which there were errors.

In the evaluator's opinion the reduction of error correction created a more positive environment. Students felt free to ask for correction.

B. Non-Verbal Behaviour

As the first weekend proved, this group of monitors are particularly good communicators. Their use of gestures, smiles and good voice control continued to be above average. Where pacing and speed had been a problem, the monitors concerned made a concerted effort to slow the pace and speed of speech.

C. Use of Question Techniques

In general, there was a marked increase in the use of all forms of questions. Monitors had developed games and group situations which facilitated questioning techniques for students.

Monitors appeared to be more aware of questioning techniques. In various situations a monitor would re-phrase another's question in order to use a higher level question.

Assessment

The greatest increase was in the area of fluency questions. Monitors asked more questions of this type. They also created situations in which students asked questions.

Questions such as "vous avez compris?" were used far less. Monitors should be encouraged to explore "questions de contrôle" which allow them to verify student comprehension.

Probing questions and divergent questions were frequently used.

In the evaluator's opinion the monitors had shown great improvement in question techniques.

There is still a tendency to fall back on lecture-style presentations. It is no doubt seen to be highly efficient. Although this is true, it is more effective to rely on the knowledge and experience of the participants. Monitors should be encouraged to avoid lecturing (for example on topics such as Quebec history or geography) and to explore questioning, panels, etc. to elicit the information.

VII. FOLLOW-UP SESSION

The Director, monitors and evaluator met in the week following to discuss the above observations. The evaluator was impressed by the positive changes and communicated this to the monitors. Discussion touched on the weaknesses referred to above. Suggestions for change were exchanged.

VIII. REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 1980 RECOMMENDATIONS

1) Timing of the Weekends

It was recommended that the dates of weekends be reviewed. No weekends were cancelled this year. Furthermore, the Director showed an awareness of student needs and innovated several changes. There were two one-day immersions as well as two morning immersions for true beginners.

2) Variation of Themes

The evaluator was very aware of the number of students who returned this year for a weekend. The imagination shown by the monitors in their choice of themes certainly was positive for all. They were also very creative in their treatment of themes.

Date	Theme
September 27-28	le 75ième Anniversaire de l'Alberta
October 18-19	Halloween
November 15-16	La Joie de Vivre au Québec
February 7-8	Le Carnaval du Québec

The increase in numbers is ample evidence of the popularity and success of the weekends.

3) Monitor In-Service and Selection of Candidates

A. Background

As monitors are not trained second language teachers, indeed are often not involved in teaching programs, they need in-service.

It is particularly important that this occur before any immersion activities so that they are sensitized to some of the difficulties of the participants. They must also be made aware of their role during the weekend and the expectations of the administration.

Monitors attended the in-service. Activities were planned so that prospective monitors could be observed interacting with others. On this basis a group of six were chosen. They were placed in a probationary period. All monitors were engaged to serve in the Drop-In Centre as well. (Some monitors work in the Drop-In Centre only.)

Assessment

From the questionnaire (Appendix C) it is apparent that the pre-session in-service was valuable. In the evaluator's opinion it is a *sina qua non* for immersion weekends whether they are managed by monitors or by teaching personnel. The period of orientation (in-service) accomplishes several goals:

a) creates awareness of the adult learner's strengths and weaknesses
b) recalls techniques for facilitating conversation
c) stresses the importance of good L_2 teaching in the planning of the program
d) fosters a feeling of cooperation and team work in the monitors

This particular in-service served several other goals - a sort of hidden agenda! It allowed for a screening of prospective monitors, it emphasized the expectations of the monitor by the administration, it gave the role

of the monitor a certain profile: monitors were not guaranteed employment simply because they were francophone. A job description and expectations were clear to all from the outset.

This awareness coupled with the diligence of the administration in overseeing the weekends and in giving clearly defined authority to the "leader" put the program on a much firmer basis from the outset.

CONCLUSION

The French Centre is to be commended for the strength and vigor it has given to its program and to its monitors.

In particular the evaluator would like to encourage them

1) to continue the pre-session in-service of monitors
2) to maintain the diversity of immersion situations: weekend, one-day and morning immersions
3) to maintain the format of the weekend while allowing freedom to change activities
4) to continue to rotate the leadership of weekends among participating monitors
5) to pursue actively in-service sessions which concentrate on second language teaching techniques (questioning techniques, ways of correcting, ways of simplifying language, etc.).

It is recommended that

1) consideration be given to starting immersion weekends on Friday evening.

APPENDICES

APPENDICES

I Appendix A - Proposal submitted to Advanced Education & Manpower

II Appendix B - Observation Collection Charts

1) Types of Questions
2) Corrections
3) Non-Verbal Behaviour

III Appendix C - Résumé of Monitors' Questionnaires

IV Appendix D - Intervention In-Service Materials

1) Non-Verbal Behaviour Exercise
2) Quelques Questions à Analyser
3) Probing Questions
4) Questions Abstraites et Questions Provocantes

PROPOSAL TO THE DEPARTMENT OF ADVANCED EDUCATION AND MANPOWER

I. (a) NAME OF INSTITUTION: The University of Calgary

(b) CONTACT PERSON: Donna Mydlarski, 284-6827

(c) PROPOSED LOCATION OF PROJECT: to be specified among Yamnuska Centre, Seebe, Alberta; Silver Creek Ranch, Cremona, Alberta; Lacombe Inter-Faith Centre, Midnapore, Alberta; Edmonton, Alberta, possibly the Faculté St-Jean.

(d) PROJECT TITLE: French Immersion Weekends

(e) AUTHORIZATION:

Dr. R. S. Chapman, Dean
Faculty of Continuing Education

II. OBJECTIVE OF THE PROJECT:

To provide an informal learning environment conducive to spontaneous expression in the second language, thereby constituting a valuable service to instructional programs both of a credit and non-credit nature.

III. CONTENT DESCRIPTION:

The student/monitor ratio of five to one will assure optimal participation of all students. All communication during the weekend must be in the target language. A variety of linguistic, social and cultural activities are organized, usually around a theme such as "la cabane à sucre" or some other aspect of the French-Canadian cultural heritage. Songs are used extensively. At least one weekend will be planned for Edmonton to participate in the cultural life of the French-Canadian community there. In addition, mini-immersions of 3 - 5 hours will be organized in the Fall term for beginners only, as this group is reticent about joining in the regular immersions. It is hoped that communicative activities directed at the beginners' particular needs combined with a shorter duration would encourage these students to express themselves in French and would eliminate the discouragement that sometimes results when they are placed with considerably more advanced students.

IV. TARGET POPULATION:

Any student taking a French course at the University of Calgary (credit or non-credit). Limit of 30 students per weekend.

V. FORMAT:

(a) TOTAL NUMBER OF CONTACT HOURS - 26 hours per weekend

(b) PROPOSED STARTING DATE - 3 weekends in the Fall term 1980
1 or 2 weekends in the Winter term 1981
2 or 3 immersion days for beginners in the Fall term 1980

This schedule is subject to change due to student interest and enrollments.

VI. PERSONNEL:

Director: Donna Mydlarski, BEd, MA

Monitors: To be selected from among instructors and French-speaking students on campus. They will be required to attend a training workshop on planning and organizing second-language immersions and an in-service evaluation (see section VII, re the latter).

VII. EVALUATION:

The 1979-80 evaluation examined in depth the organization and content of Immersion Weekends. Since the changes recommended were relatively minor, the 1980-81 evaluation will focus on the crucial role of the monitor and will be essentially formative.

The proposed plan would be implemented by P. Klinck:

a) Observation of first weekend to identify the use of non-verbals, questioning techniques and correction techniques.

b) The following week: an in-service with monitors led by P. Klinck to discuss weaknesses perceived in the areas observed under a).

c) Follow-up observation of second weekend.

d) The following week: evaluation session with monitors led by P. Klinck.

The monitors and the director will use a short written questionnaire to obtain feedback on each weekend and mini-immersion.

Pat Klinck will be responsible for writing the final evaluation report on the overall program of Immersion Weekends and "Beginners Days" to determine the effectiveness of organizational changes and use of personnel.

VIII. BUDGET (see attached sheet)

Types of Questions	Student	Teacher
1. Fluency (a) factual		
(b) descriptive		
2. Probing		
3. Higher Order		
4. Divergent Questions		

When does correction start?	What is corrected?	How is it corrected?

	Eye Contact	Voice	Gestures	Facial Expressions	Small Moves
MONITOR					

APPENDIX C

Selected Answers to Monitor Questionnaire

1. Before starting as monitor you received an in-service course. What was the most valuable aspect of this in-service?

   "The discussion and exercises relating to communication skills. Also the workshops given by Daniel and Cheryl. Both passed on their enthusiasm about their work."

   "Faire acte de présence était la seule façon d'avoir une chance d'avoir l'emploi."

   What would you change (add, delete, increase)?

   "I felt a little uneasy, as no one was as yet hired and this meant working in a competitive environment. Other monitors expressed the same sentiment."

   "J'attendrais d'avoir engagé pour sûr les moniteurs."

2. How have you felt about the rotation of weekend leaders? Would you like to see it again next year?

   "It is a very, very, very good idea. Non seulement j'aimerais, mais il faudrait que ça fonctionne comme ça aussi l'an prochain."

   "I found the distribution of responsibilities quite professional. During the organization, all monitors contributed ideas but when came the immersions weekend, one person coordinated and had the final authority."

   "L'idée est excellente, ça donne l'occasion à chaque personne de se sentir un peu plus responsable, et dans le fond de nous-même on aime tous être un petit peu chef!!!!! C'est absolument à continuer."

   "Je crois que c'était bien car chacun notre tour, on apprenait à prendre un peu plus de responsabilités."

3. Have you found the presence of evaluator inhibiting? If yes, can you suggest changes?

   "The presence of an evaluator always keeps us on our toes."

APPENDIX C - cont'd

"Non. Spécialement Pat Klinck, qui connaît l'art d'observer, soit l'art d'être présente tout en étant effacée."

4. Your second in-service was on non-verbals (gestures, voice, etc.), correcting and questioning techniques. What was the most useful aspect?

"Techniques on questioning was the most useful."

What would you change (add, delete, increase emphasis)?

"Perhaps more practical exercises regarding closed and open ended questioning techniques."

5. Did you find the following session after the 2nd weekend useful?

"The session was directed to improvement of the program therefore I cannot argue with improvement."

"Oui, ça a permis de faire le point en théorie, restait à le faire en pratique."

6. The enrolment in weekend immersion has increased steadily. To what do you attribute this success?

"I have noticed a considerable difference in enthusiasm between last year and this year's monitors."

"Au bouche à oreille des participants entre eux qui ont communiqué leur satisfaction - Pourquoi étaient - ils satisfaits? La personnalité chaleureuse et la 'conscience professionnelle' des monitrices et moniteurs."

"Il y a beaucoup plus de gens qui fréquentent le centre quotidiennement. Donc avec l'ambiance qui règne au centre. C'est facile d'attirer les gens vers les fins de seraine. Et je pense que c'est les moniteurs tous ensemble qui ont su créer cette atmosphère!!!

7. Other comments or suggestions which would assist in ensuring continued success.

"(1) Continuation of the in-service courses.
(2) Offer more mini-immersions throughout the year.
(3) More activities in the French Centre."

"Continuer comme ça et surtout, laisser cette belle liberté aux moniteurs!"

	encourager l'étudiant	établir une ambiance chaleureuse	pour établir une ambiance de participation
les gestes			
l'expression			
le regard			
la voix			

QUELQUES QUESTIONS A ANALYSER

1. Est-ce que le fait de parler la langue change les impressions d'un pays pour un étranger?

2. Combien de temps avez-vous passé en Allemagne?

3. Comment est-ce qu'on vous a reçu en Europe et désirez-vous y retourner l'été prochain?

4. De toutes les villes que vous avez visitées, laquelle préférez-vous, Paris ou Londres?

5. Racontez -nous votre voyage en Europe.

6. A votre avis quel moyen de transport est le plus agréable pour voyager en Europe?

7. Quelles sont les différences les plus frappantes entre le style de vivre européen et américain?

8. Vous avez préféré l'Italie à l'Espagne, n'est-ce pas?

"PROBING QUESTIONS"

Vous avez la question d'un professeur et la réponse de l'étudiant. Posez une autre question pour clarifier la réponse de l'étudiant.

1. Prof: Pour quoi est-ce que la plupart des Indiens étaient du côté des Français pendant les guerres?

   Etud: Parce que les Indiens aimaient bien les Français.

   Votre question:

2. Prof: En dépit de toute évidence qui indique que le cancer des poumons et les cigarettes sont liés il y a des milliers de gens qui continuent à fumer. Pourquoi?

   Etud: Ils aiment le goût des cigarettes.

   Vous:

3. Prof: Comment est-ce que votre vie changerait si vous n'étiez pas obligé de travailler?

   Etud: Je ne me lèverais plus de bonne heure.

   Vous:

QUESTIONS ABSTRAITES

1. Changez ces questions pour qu'elles obligent une réponse bien réfléchie. Par exemple:
   - Quel savant a découvert la bombe atomique?
   - Pourquoi est-ce que la découverte de la bombe atomique a eu lieu pendant la deuxième guerre mondiale?

1. Comment s'appelle ce tableau?

2. Quelles sont les planètes? Commencez avec celle qui est la plus près du soleil?

3. Quelle sorte de voiture est-ce?

4. Où se trouve Paris?

5. Qui a fondé la ville de Calgary?

LES QUESTIONS PROVOCANTES

Modifiez ces questions pour en faire de plus créatrices.
eg. De quels éléments est composée la surface du monde?

- Si la lune et la terre avaient la même atmosphère est-ce que l'exploration de la lune changerait?

1. Quel est le plus grand animal du monde?

2. Quand est-ce que la radio a été inventée?

3. Quelle langue parle-t-on au Brésil?

4. Pourquoi est-ce que le site de Calgary a contribué à sa croissance démographique?

5. Quelle est la population actuelle du Canada?